

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims, 1, 15 and 18 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 15 and 18 can be found in at least Fig. 2 and the corresponding description in the specification. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Abdulselam at the interview held July 10, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

**I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciate the April 3, 2007 Office Action's indication that claims 4-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are allowed. However, for at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejected claims are also allowable.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-3, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP Publication No. 11-198845 to Wataru et al. in view of JP Publication No. 10-221424 to Yoshio. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Wataru and Yoshio, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest "operation nullification canceller that automatically cancels prohibition against the inputting of the predetermined operation performed by the operator as the operator guidance if a predetermined time period has elapsed since the prohibition against the inputting of the predetermined operation performed by the operator as the operator guidance," as recited in independent claim 1 (emphasis added). Further, as agreed during the personal interview, Wataru and Yoshio, alone or in a permissible combination do not teach or suggest "operation nullification cancel means for automatically canceling prohibition against the inputting of the predetermined operation performed by the

operator as the operator guidance if a predetermined time period has elapsed since the prohibition against the inputting of the predetermined operation performed by the operator as the operator guidance, as recited in independent claim 15 (emphasis added). Moreover, as argued during the personal interview, Wataru and Yoshio do not teach or suggest "automatically canceling prohibition against the inputting of the predetermined operation performed by the operator as the operator guidance if a predetermined time period has elapsed since the prohibition against the inputting of the predetermined operation performed by the operator as the operator guidance", as recited in independent claim 18 (emphasis added).

The Office Action acknowledges that "Wataru's release switches (12, 13) are not automatic and the predetermined time mentioned is not the time elapsed right before the release of the switches (12, 13)." As previously argued in the October 7, 2005 Request for Reconsideration, the predetermined period of Wataru occurs after the release switches 12 and 13 are initially pressed. See, e.g., Wataru, paragraph [0021] and Fig. 7. Furthermore, Yoshio does not remedy the deficiencies of Wataru.

As previously argued in the July 3, 2007 Request for Reconsideration, Yoshio merely discloses switching at least a part of the information so that a part of the display is intensified so as to be more noticeable than other information at night (Yoshio, Abstract). In other words, Yoshio merely changes the illumination of the display at a preset night period. Thus, the time period of Yoshio does not elapse, "since the prohibition against the inputting of the predetermined operation performed by the operator as the operator guidance."

Thus, for at least these reasons and those asserted in the July 3, 2007 Request for Reconsideration, claims 1, 15 and 18 are patentable over Yoshio and Wataru. Further, claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over Yoshio and Wataru for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: August 1, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our <u>Deposit Account No. 15-0461</u>
--